

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-62 are pending. Claims 1, 14, 19, 36, 41, and 58 are amended.

5 Claims 14, 36 and 58 have been amended to correct a typographical error.

Claims 1, 19 and 41 have been amended to limit the claim scope to aneutral black ink comprising a combination of carbon black, cyan and violet while deleting the alternative neutral black ink comprising the combination of carbon black, cyan and violet. The specification has also been amended on page 19
10 to correct an inconsistency between a number in the description of Figure 8 and the corresponding number that is shown on Figure 8 itself. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 19 and 41 stand rejected while claims 2-18, 20-40 and 42-62 stand

15 allowed.

Claims 14, 36 and 58 are objected to because they recite "PV23" twice in the same line. Claims 14, 36 and 58 have been amended to delete the second occurrence of "PV23". Therefore this objection is overcome.

20

The Examiner objects to the disclosure because in the description of Figure 2, the numeral "213" that appears on the graph does appear on page 11 of the specification. However, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 10, lines 32-34, which refers to 213 in a description of the color map in Figure 2 and
25 describes the area described as 213 as "the color of the neutral medium gray ink blend, the dots designated as 213 on the color map." Applicants therefore request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

30

The Examiner objects to the drawings because they fail to show "817 (increasing violet)" as described in the specification. Applicants have amended the specification to change the number "817" to "818". The number "818" shown in Figure 8 designates the position of "increasing violet " on the color map. This position 818 on Figure 8 is what is being referred to in the sen-

tence on page 19, line 28-29 which describes the increasing violet dots 817 as tending to shift diagonally NW to SE. By correcting the discrepancy in the specification by amending "817" to "818" on page 19, the Examiner's objection is obviated and it becomes unnecessary to correct the drawings.

5

The above amendments are responsive to the Examiner's rejections and no new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request that all of the above objections be withdrawn.

- 10 Claims 1, 19 and 41 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5, 9, 12, 21, 22, 24, 26 of copending Application No. 10/460,482. In response, Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer which disclaims any period of patent enforceability beyond the statutory term of any patent issuing
15 from Application Serial No. 10/460,482. With the submission of this Terminal Disclaimer, Applicants respectfully asserts that the Double Patenting rejection should be withdrawn.

- Furthermore, Claims 1, 19 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section
20 102(b) as being anticipated by Katsen et al. Furthermore claims 1, 19 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sano. With both references, the Examiner alleges that since the references teach a black inkjet ink which comprises carbon black, cyan and magenta pigments, that the neutral properties of the presently claimed invention are inherent in the black
25 inkjet inks of the references.

- Neither Katsen nor Sano teach anything about mixing violet with carbon black and cyan to achieve a black inkjet ink. As amended, the claims 1, 19 and 41 comprise only carbon black, cyan and violet pigments in neutral inkjet ink.
30 Therefore, the applicants respectfully assert that the presently claimed invention is neither anticipated nor suggested by Katsen or Sano. Neither can it be inherent in Katsen or Sano.

With the above-amendments and arguments as well as the submission of the terminal disclaimer, applicant respectfully requests that the various objections as well as the obviousness-type double patenting rejection, the Section 102(b) rejection and the Section 102(e) rejection all be withdrawn.

5

A positive and timely response to this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

10

Stephen W. Bauer et al.

15 Hewlett-Packard Company
1000 NE Circle Blvd MS 422B
Corvallis, OR 97330

W. Bradley Haymond
W. Bradley Haymond
Reg. No. 35,186
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone: (541) 715-0159

I hereby certify that this correspondence is
being deposited on **April 18, 2005**, with the
20 United States Postal Service as first class mail in an
envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner
for Patents, Washington DC 20231

25 Signature
W. Bradley Haymond
Typed Name
April 18, 2005
Date of Signature

30